

ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. CR 03-570

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

BILLY JOE CAMPBELL
Appellant

v.

STATE OF ARKANSAS
Appellee

Opinion Delivered March 16, 2006

PRO SE APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF CLARK COUNTY, CR 2001-80, HON. JOHN
ALEXANDER THOMAS, JUDGE

AFFIRMED

PER CURIAM

Billy Joe Campbell entered guilty pleas to manufacturing the controlled substance crack cocaine; possession of a controlled substance, crack cocaine, with intent to deliver; possession of drug paraphernalia; second-degree battery; maintaining a drug premises in a drug-free zone; and resisting arrest. He received an aggregate sentence of 600 months' imprisonment in a judgment entered August 15, 2002. Campbell timely filed a *pro se* petition for postconviction relief under Ark. R. Crim. P. 37.1, which was denied without a hearing. Now before us is his appeal of that order.

In an unpublished opinion, we previously ordered rebriefing of this matter, finding that the brief filed failed to include a sufficient abstract as required by Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(5) and (8). *Campbell v. State*, CR 03-570 (Ark. April 28, 2005) (*per curiam*). Appellant Campbell has now filed his substituted brief, and it is still deficient. Although appellant has included a section within the brief that is labeled as the abstract in its heading, his plea hearing is not abstracted as specifically required by our order. Instead, appellant uses that portion of the brief to amplify his arguments, rather than providing an impartial condensation of the proceedings as Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(5) requires. Without a proper abstract, we cannot address appellant's claims. An appellant must provide an abstract and addendum sufficient to conduct a meaningful review. *Campbell v. State*, 349 Ark. 111, 76 S.W.3d 271 (2002) (*per curiam*). Appellant has not provided a substituted brief curing the

deficiencies as required in our order. We therefore affirm for failure to file a complying brief in accordance with Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3).

Affirmed.